



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/821,190	03/29/2001	Martin A. Kenner	56096US002	4518

32692 7590 11/21/2005

3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY  
PO BOX 33427  
ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427

EXAMINER

OSMAN, RAMY M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2157

DATE MAILED: 11/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/821,190	KENNER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ramy M. Osman	2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 September 2005.  
 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10 and 11 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.  
 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)               | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Status of Claims*

1. This communication is in response to amendment filed on 9/8/2005, where applicant amended claims 1,9,12,13,18,20,32,36-40, cancelled claims 10,11, and added new claims 43,44.. Claims 1-44 are pending.

### *Response to Arguments*

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-44 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

3. In regards to 112 first paragraph rejection of claims 5,27 and 35, applicant argues that IP addresses are unlike email addresses, and that IP address do not permit a web site to identify a user.

**In reply**, the claims are broad and contain limitations not enabled by the specification. Firstly, IP addresses do permit a web site to identify a user because it is with that IP address that the web site uses to respond to the requesting user and send information back to that user. Secondly, nowhere in the claim or specification does the applicant mention the type of identification that is being referred to. Therefore the 'without identifying' feature, as presently mentioned in the claim, is not enabled.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claim 5,27,35 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicant states that the method “is performed without identifying the content recipient to the content provider”. The specification merely repeats this language on page 29 lines 5-10, and fails to further explain how a client can request something without identifying itself. A client request inherently involves some sort of identification so that the provider can respond and send information back to the client. Internet request packets include source and destination IP address fields. It is therefore seen that the source (i.e. content recipient) is identified, and the provider uses that identifier to respond to the recipient. To anonymize this identification, a method or protocol is necessary to accomplish it. Applicant fails to detail this feature.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

**7. Claims 1-8,10-13,30-34 and 37 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by over Mano et al (US Patent No 5,978,807).**

8. In reference to claims 1 and 32, Mano teaches a method performed at a content recipient, and a computer readable storage comprising:

executing first program code at the content recipient so as to identify a content provider having posted content of interest to the content recipient (column 2 lines 37-56 and column 4 lines 15-33,46-53 & 65-67);

executing second program code at the content recipient so as to automatically initiate a request for the posted content (column 2 lines 37-56 and column 5 lines 2-23).

executing third program code at the content recipient so as to receive the posted content at the content recipient in response to execution of the second program code (column 5 lines 1-25); and

executing fourth program code at the content recipient so as to provide notice to the content recipient that the posted content has been received at the content recipient in response to execution of the second and third program code (column 5 lines 10-45 and column 6 lines 20-25).

9. In reference to claim 2,4,6,8 and 33, Mano teaches the method and computer readable storage of claims 1 and 32 further comprising canceling future requests for the posted content without communicating such an intent to the content provider (Summary and column 4 lines 15-33,46-53 & 65-67, Since Mano teaches that a user can input an address for automatic download, then it is inherent that the user can also delete that entry if the user decides not to retrieve downloads anymore).

Art Unit: 2157

10. In reference to claim 3,7 and 34, Mano teaches the method and computer readable storage of claims 1,18 and 32 wherein the executing of the second program code at the content recipient so as to automatically initiate a request for the posted content comprises executing second program code at the content recipient so as to automatically and recurrently initiate requests for the posted content (column 2 lines 37-56 and column 5 lines 2-23).

11. In reference to claims 5 and 35, Mano teaches the method and computer readable storage of claims 1 and 32, wherein the method is performed without identifying the content recipient to the content provider (column 2 lines 37-56).

12. In reference to claims 12,30,31 and 36, Mano teaches the method and computer of claims 1, wherein executing third program code so that the posted content, when received, is displayed behind a session if the session is active (column 5 lines 2-45).

13. In reference to claims 30 and 31, Mano teaches the computer of claim 18 wherein the stored program code is electronically received from a remote site and is stored by the computer readable storage medium (column 5 lines 2-45).

14. In reference to claims 13 and 37, Mano teaches the method and computer readable storage of claims 12 and 36, further comprising executing fourth program code at the content recipient so as to provide notice to the content recipient that the posted content has been received at the content recipient in response to execution of the second and third program code, wherein the notice is displayed even if the session is active (column 4 lines 30-50 and column 5 lines 10-45, Mano discloses providing date and time notice of downloads).

Art Unit: 2157

15. In reference to claim 43, Mano teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising executing fifth program code at the content recipient so that, upon an action related to the notice, the posted content is displayed to a user (column 5 lines 2-45).

16. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

**17. Claims 18-22,44 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lynch et al (US Patent No 6,963,908).**

18. In reference to claim 18, Lynch teaches a computer readable medium, storing code, when executed by a computing device, performs the following functions:

automatically initiating a request for the download of a content element of a web page posted by a content provider (column 4 line 50 – column 5 line 20, column 11 lines 5-30, and column 12 lines 5-15); and

receiving only the content element in response to the request without receiving the whole web page (column 12 line 57 – column 13 line 15).

19. In reference to claims 19,21, Lynch teaches the computer readable storage medium of claim 18, wherein the code provides notice that the posted content has been received in response to the request (column 12 line 57 – column 13 line 15).

Art Unit: 2157

20. In reference to claims 20,22, Lynch teaches the computer readable storage medium of claim 18, wherein the code when executed displays the posted content, when received, behind a session if the session is active (column 12 line 57 – column 13 line 30).

21. In reference to claim 27, Lynch teaches the method and computer readable storage of claim 18, wherein the method is performed without identifying the content recipient to the content provider (column 4 line 50 – column 5 line 20).

22. In reference to claim 29, Lynch teaches the method and computer readable storage of claim 18, providing notice that no posted content has been received in response to the request (column 13 lines 10-40).

23. In reference to claim 44, Lynch teaches the method and computer readable storage of claim 18, wherein the content element comprises a note attached to the web page (column 12 line 57 – column 13 line 40).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

24. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

25. **Claim 9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mano et al (US Patent No 5,978,807) in view of Chang et al (US Patent No 6,134,584).**



Mano teaches the method and computer readable storage of claim 18. Mano fails to explicitly teach providing notice to the content recipient that no posted content has been received by the content recipient in response to execution of the second program code. However, Chang teaches scheduling data download from a server over a network. Chang discloses retrieving data from a server and if the download is unsuccessful then an unsuccessful download message is generated for the user and an unsuccessful signal is generated to try another download attempt (column 5 lines 50-65 and column 6 lines 35-45).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Mano by providing notice to the content recipient that no posted content has been received by the content recipient in response to execution of the second program code as per the teachings of Chang for the purpose of alerting the user of an unsuccessful download and to try another download attempt.

**26. Claim 14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mano (US Patent No 6,167,567) in view of Beyda et al (US Patent No 6,636,965).**

Mano teaches the method of claim 13 above. Mano fails to explicitly teach wherein the notice is an icon. However, Beyda teaches recipients receiving electronic messages. Beyda discloses icons accompanying the messages for the purpose of alerting users of the message (Abstract and column 4 lines 10-20).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Mano by making the notice an icon as per the teachings of Beyda complete messages for the purpose of alerting users of the message.

**27. Claims 15,16,38 and 39 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mano (US Patent No 6,167,567) in view of Pike (US Patent No 4,555,775).**

Mano teaches the method and computer readable storage of claims 13 and 37 above. Mano fails to explicitly teach wherein the method further comprises executing fifth program code at the content recipient so that, upon an action related to the notice, the posted content burns through the session so that the posted content is visible to a user; and comprises executing fifth program code at the content recipient so that, upon an action related to the notice, the posted content is displayed in front of the session so that the posted content is visible to a user. However, Pike teaches overlaying windows for multiple active programs. Pike discloses bringing a window layer to the front of all other layers so that the layer can then be visible to a user (column 2 lines 3-11 & 53-67 and column 10 lines 20-67).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Mano by bringing content to the front when a certain action occurs as per the teachings of Pike so that the content can be prioritized and made visible to the user.

**28. Claim 23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lynch et al (US Patent No 6,963,908) in view of Beyda et al (US Patent No 6,636,965).**

Lynch teaches the computer readable storage of claim 22 above. Lynch fails to explicitly teach wherein the notice is an icon. However, Beyda teaches recipients receiving electronic messages. Beyda discloses icons accompanying the messages for the purpose of alerting users of the message (Abstract and column 4 lines 10-20).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lynch by making the notice an icon as per the teachings of Beyda complete messages for the purpose of alerting users of the message.

**29. Claims 24,25 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lynch et al (US Patent No 6,963,908) in view of Pike (US Patent No 4,555,775).**

Lynch teaches the computer readable storage of claim 18 above. Lynch fails to explicitly teach burning the posted content the posted content through a session so that the posted content is visible to a user; and displaying the posted content in front of the session so that the posted content is visible to a user. However, Pike teaches overlaying windows for multiple active programs. Pike discloses bringing a window layer to the front of all other layers so that the layer can then be visible to a user (column 2 lines 3-11 & 53-67 and column 10 lines 20-67).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lynch by bringing content to the front when a certain action occurs as per the teachings of Pike so that the content can be prioritized and made visible to the user.

**30. Claims 26 and 28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lynch et al (US Patent No 6,963,908) in view of Mano (US Patent No 6,167,567).**

Lynch teaches the computer readable storage of claim 18. Lynch fails to explicitly teach wherein the stored code when executed, automatically and recurrently initiate requests for the posted content. However Mano teaches automatically and recurrently initiate requests for the posted content (column 2 lines 37-56 and column 5 lines 2-23).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lynch by automatically and recurrently initiate requests for the posted content as per the teachings of Mano so that information can be automatically acquired from the Internet to be viewed by a user at their convenience.

**31. Claims 17 and 40-42 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mano (US Patent No 6,167,567) in view of Kullick et al (US Patent No 5,732,275).**

32. In reference to claims 17, 41 and 42, Mano teaches the method and computer readable storage of claims 1 and 32. Mano fails to explicitly teach electronically receiving the second program code at the content recipient from the content provider. However, Kullick teaches managing and updating programs. Kullick discloses programs that are provided by developers to clients and where the clients can download upgrades to the provided programs to keep them up-to-date (column 3 lines 44-65).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Mano by electronically receiving the second program code at the content recipient from the content provider as per the teachings of Kullick so that clients can download upgrades to the provided programs to keep them up-to-date.

33. In reference to claim 40, Mano teaches the method of claim 32 further comprising executing third program code at the content provider so as to determine whether the content recipient possesses the second program code and, if the content recipient does not possess the second program code, to download the second program code to the content recipient (Kullick, column 3 lines 44-65).

34. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramy M. Osman whose telephone number is (571) 272-4008. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2157

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RMO

November 13, 2005

  
BRIDGETTE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100